arXiv:0810.0755v2 [cond-mat.soft] 11 Oct 2008

DNA Bubble Life Time in Denaturation

Zh.S. Gevorkian[1,2,3] and Chin-Kun Hu[1,4]

[1]*Institute of Physics, Academia of Sinica, Nankang, Taipei 11529, Taiwan*

[2] *Institute of Radiophysics and Electronics,Ashtarak-2,378410, Armenia*

[3] *Yerevan Physics Institute, Alikhanian Brothers St. 2, Yerevan 375036, Armenia. and*

[4]*Center for Nonlinear and Complex Systems and Department of Physics,*
Chung Yuan Christian University, Chungli 32023, Taiwan

(Dated: October 13, 2008)

Abstract

We have investigated the denaturation bubble life time for a homogeneous as well as for a heterogeneous DNA within a Poland-Scheraga model. It is shown that at criticality the bubble life time for a homogeneous DNA is finite provided that the loop entropic exponent $c > 2$ and has a scaling dependence on DNA length for $c < 2$. Heterogeneity in the thermodynamical limit makes the bubble life time infinite for any entropic exponent.

PACS numbers: 87.15.-v, 87.14.gK, 87.15. H-

Introduction. DNA denaturation has a long history [1, 2]. With variation of temperature or the solvent pH value double-stranded DNA denatures, yielding regions of single stranded DNA, until the double strand is fully molten at a melting temperature T_m. The melting temperature is between $60^o - 100^o C$ depending on the ratio of AT and GC pairs in DNA. However, a local base opening is possible even at room temperatures [3]. This fact explains the biological relevance of local denaturation. In particular, it is relevant to the transcription process where a DNA is partially opened for RNA polymerase to read the template. A DNA bubble consists of two flexible single strands with fluctuating size. The bubble size varies from a few broken pairs well below T_m up to several hundreds closer to T_m. A well-known model of DNA melting is Poland-Scheraga model [1].

In the Poland-Scheraga model, the partition function of a single bubble has the form:

$$Z(y) = \sigma_0 \exp\left[-\beta \int_0^y dy \varepsilon(y)\right] (1+y)^{-c} \tag{1}$$

where y is the bubble size, i.e the number of broken AT or GC base pairs, $\varepsilon(y,T)$ is a free energy released by a broken base pair, $\beta = 1/T$ and $\sigma_0 = e^{-\varepsilon_0/T}$ is the statistical weight for initiation of a loop. In physiological conditions it is very small $\sim 10^{-5}$ which means that the formation of a loop is a rare effect and one can consider a single loop instead of many loops. The function $\varepsilon(y,T)$ describes the heterogeneity of the loop.

Recent renewed interest to the bubbles dynamics [4]-[12] is due to the new experimental possibilities opened by molecule fluorescence correlation spectroscopy(FCS) [13]. It enables one to monitor the bubble dynamics in a real time. One of important problem in the bubble dynamics is the length dependence of the averaged bubble life time. Previously it was reported [11] that for $c > 1$ the bubble life time is finite and in the thermodynamical limit it does not depend on the length both at critical and non-critical temperatures. In the present article we study this problem within the Poland-Scheraga model in a systematic way. We get results different from those obtained in [11].

Initial Relations. We assume that $\varepsilon(y,T)$ has the form

$$\varepsilon(y,T) = \varepsilon(T) + \eta(y,T) \tag{2}$$

where $\varepsilon(T) \sim T_c - T$ is an average value and $\eta(y,T)$ is a random function describing the randomness of DNA sequence consisting of AT and GC pairs. The factor $(1+y)^{-c}$ takes into account the lack of entropy of the loop compared to a single strand with the same length.

The free energy of the bubble correspondingly takes the form

$$F(y) = \varepsilon_0 + \int_0^y \varepsilon(y)dy + cTln(1+y) \tag{3}$$

The relaxation time of a bubble is much longer $(10 - 100\mu s)$ than the relaxation times of polymeric degrees of freedom. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that the bubble dynamics takes place on the background of thermodynamical equilibrium for polymeric degrees of freedom and is governed by a stochastic Langevin equation

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = -D\frac{dF(y)}{dy} + \varsigma(t) \tag{4}$$

where $\varsigma(t)$ is a thermal gaussian white noise

$$< \varsigma(t)\varsigma(t') >= 2DT\delta(t-t'), \quad < \varsigma(t) >= 0 \tag{5}$$

and D is the diffusion coefficient in the base pairs unit.

Using Eqs.(3-5), we can obtain the Fokker-Planck equation for a probability density function (PDF) [14]

$$\frac{\partial P(y,t)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left[D(\varepsilon + \eta(y)) + \frac{cTD}{y+1}\right] P(y,t) + DT\frac{\partial^2 P(y,t)}{\partial y^2} \tag{6}$$

It is convenient to introduce new units [11] and rewrite Eq.(6)in a simpler form

$$\frac{\partial P(y,t)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left[\varepsilon + \eta(y) + \frac{\nu}{y+1}\right] P(y,t) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 P(y,t)}{\partial y^2} \tag{7}$$

where we redefine $\varepsilon \to \varepsilon/2T$, $t \to 2DTt$, $\nu = c/2$ and $\eta(y,T) \to \eta(y,T)/2T$. Eq.(7) is a generalization of the corresponding Fokker-Planck equation for a homogeneous DNA [11]. At the denaturation transition point the number of opened base pairs is large $y \gg 1$. Then if one neglects the entropic term in Eq.(7) $\nu/(y+1)$, the problem is reduced to the Sinai diffusion [17] of a particle in random environments [10, 18]. However we will keep it because as we will see below it plays important role in the denaturation bubble dynamics.

Homogeneous DNA. In order to simplify the Fokker-Planck equation Eq.(7) we introduce a new function $\tilde{P}$

$$P(y,t) = (1+y)^{-\nu}\tilde{P}(y,t). \tag{8}$$

Substituting Eq.(8) into Eq.(7), one obtains an equation for $\tilde{P}$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \tilde{P}(y,t)}{\partial t} &= \frac{\partial\left[\varepsilon + \eta(y)\right]\tilde{P}(y,t)}{\partial y} - \\ &- \frac{\nu(\varepsilon + \eta(y))}{y+1}\tilde{P}(y,t) - \frac{\nu(\nu+1)}{(y+1)^2}\tilde{P}(y,t) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{P}(y,t)}{\partial y^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

As it follows from Eq.(9), far distant from the melting temperature $\varepsilon \gg \eta$, therefore heterogeneity will not play an essential role in bubble dynamics. We will consider the bubble dynamics at criticality $\varepsilon \equiv 0$ where the role of heterogeneity is more important. First we consider a homogeneous DNA case. In this case $\eta(y) \equiv 0$ and the Fokker-Planck equation Eq.(9) is reduced to a Scrödinger equation in imaginary time

$$-\frac{\partial \tilde{P}(y,t)}{\partial t} = \hat{H}\tilde{P}(y,t) \tag{10}$$

with Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dy^2} + \frac{\nu(\nu+1)}{2(y+1)^2}. \tag{11}$$

Taking into account the initial conditions and using Eqs.(8)-(11) one can represent the PDF of bubble in the following form

$$P(y,t,y_0,0) = \left(\frac{1+y_0}{1+y}\right)^{\nu} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-E_n t}\Psi_n(y)\Psi_n(y_0). \tag{12}$$

Here we assume that at $t = 0$ the bubble size is y_0,and where E_n and Ψ_n are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of Hamiltonian Eq.(11). Note that the PDF obeys the following initial condition

$$P(y,0,y_0,0) = \delta(y - y_0). \tag{13}$$

following from the completeness of eigenfunctions Ψ_n.

For the finite DNA the eigenfunctions should satisfy the boundary conditions $\Psi_n(0) = \Psi_n(L) = 0$. Note that Eq.(12) is also correct for heterogeneous DNA, because the Fokker-Planck equation can be reduced to a Scrödinger equation in general case [14] and the corresponding potential energy term will be random. At denaturation temperature the number of opened base pairs is large $y \gg 1$, and one can neglect the centrifugal term in Eq.(11). Note that using the potential $1/y^2$ instead of $1/(y+1)^2$ as in [11] is incorrect because $1/y^2$ contains an artificial divergence at $y = 0$, which affects the long time asymptotics. Instead we can use the wave functions of quantum particle in a box with infinite walls at 0 and L with eigenvalues $E_n = \pi^2 n^2/2L^2$

$$\Psi_n(y) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L}}\sin\frac{\pi n y}{L}. \tag{14}$$

As follows from the form of E_n and Eq.(12), for $t \gg L^2$, one can be restricted by the first term in the sum and PDF will be exponentially small . For $t \ll L^2$, the sum in Eq.(12) can be substituted by an integral which is taken exactly

$$P(y, y_0, t) = \left(\frac{y_0}{y}\right)^{\nu} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi t}} \left[e^{-\frac{(y-y_0)^2}{4t}} - e^{-\frac{(y+y_0)^2}{4t}}\right]. \tag{15}$$

For $\nu < 1$ it is safe to neglect the unity in entropic factor(see below). Using Eq.(15) one can calculate the DNA bubble survival probability in the thermodynamical limit $L \to \infty$, $C(y_0, t) = \int_0^\infty dy P(y, y_0, t)$

$$C(y_0, t) \sim \frac{\Gamma(2-\nu)}{\Gamma(\frac{3-\nu}{2})} \left(\frac{y_0^2}{t}\right)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2}} \tag{16}$$

which is correct provided that $\nu < 2$ and $y_0^2 \ll t \ll L^2$. Scaling law in Eq.(16) differs from the law obtained in [10, 11], $C(t) \sim t^{-1/2-\nu}$. Bessel functions instead of sin were used [11] when obtaining this law. The problem with this Bessel functions is that they do not satisfy the correct boundary conditions at L and are unstable relative to perturbations.

Let us estimate the relative contributions of kinetic and potential energy terms of Hamiltonian Eq.(11). Using Eq.(14) one can estimate the contribution of kinetic energy term as $\sim n^2/L^2$ and potential energy term at denaturation as $\sim 1/L^2$. The typical value of $n^2 \sim L^2/t$ follows from the cut off in Eq.(12) due to the exponential function. Therefore the kinetic energy term contribution is of order $\sim 1/t$ which, for the times $t \ll L^2$, is much larger than the potential energy contribution. Henceforth, the neglecting of potential energy term is justified.

One can find the average bubble life time using the first passage time distribution function $W(t)$ [15]

$$\tau \sim \int_0^\infty t W(t) dt, \tag{17}$$

where the first passage time distribution function is expressed by the survival probability $W(t) = -dC(t)/dt$. Decomposing the integral (17) into integrals over $[0, L^2]$ and $[L^2, \infty]$ one obtains $\tau \sim L^{1-\nu}$. This scaling is a transitional intermediate behavior between finite closing time at $T < T_c$ and finite opening time at $T > T_c$. The bubble life time is maximal at criticality. For $\nu > 1$ the bubble life time is finite even at criticality.

In the existence of two absorbing boundaries the first passage time describes the time at which the brownian particle reaches one of the boundaries for the first time [15]. Applying this to our problem means that τ is either opening or closing bubble time at the criticality. So, in our consideration the critical value of loop entropic exponent is $\nu = 1 (c = 2)$ in consistent with the statics of denaturation transition [19, 20, 21]. Remind that for $c >$

2 the denaturation transition is of first order which implies a finite bubble life time in dynamics. For $c < 2$ the denaturation transition is of second order and the bubble life time correspondingly is infinite in the thermodynamical limit.

Note that the scaling result $C(t) \sim t^{-1/2-\nu}$ from [10, 11] introduces another critical value for dynamics $\nu = 1/2(c = 1)$ which does not coincide with its value in statics.

Let us explain why for investigation of asymptotic behavior of $C(y_0, t)$ the set of functions Eq.(14) is preferable compared to the set $\Phi_k(y) = (ky)^{1+\nu} J_{1/2+\nu}(ky)$, where J are Bessel functions which are exact eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian Eq.(11) with potential energy term $\nu(\nu+1)/2y^2$ and were used in [11]. Exact solution of the Scrödinger equation with the Hamiltonian Eq.(11) has the form [16]

$$\Psi_k(y) = \sqrt{y+1}\left[C_1 I_{\nu+1/2}(ik(y+1)) + C_2 K_{\nu+1/2}(ik(y+1))\right], \tag{18}$$

where $k^2 = 2E$, I and K are modified Bessel functions, C_1, C_2 are arbitrary constants which should be found from the boundary conditions $\Psi_k(0) = \Psi_k(L) = 0$. Consider the asymptotic behavior of Eq.(18). For small $ky \ll 1$, taking into account that $\Psi(0) = 0$ and expanding Eq.(18) on y, one obtains $\Psi_k(y) \sim ky$. Such a behavior differs from $(ky)^{1+\nu}$ behavior in $\Phi_k(y)$ case. The extra $(ky)^\nu$ dependence is caused by the artificial divergence of potential $1/y^2$ at $y = 0$. The correct potential is smooth at $y = 0$. Note that small ky behavior of wave functions influences the long time asymptotics of survival probability $C(t)$. For large $ky \gg 1$, using asymptotic expressions for I and K one can find $\Psi_k(y) \sim \sin ky$. Therefore the box functions (14), in contrast to $\Phi_k(y)$, correctly approximate the exact solution Eq.(18) both for large and small y.

Heterogeneous DNA. At critical temperature the number of opened base pairs is large $y \gg 1$. Therefore one can neglect terms proportional to $\eta(y)/(y+1)$ and $1/(y+1)^2$ in Eq.(9) and reduce the problem to the diffusion of particle in random environments [18]. Taking into account Eq.(8) and using the method of images to satisfy boundary condition at $y = 0$, for the averaged over the disorder PDF of heterogeneous bubble, in the thermodynamical limit $L \to \infty$, one has

$$P(y, t, y_0) = \left(\frac{y_0+1}{y+1}\right)^\nu P_S(y, t, y_o), \tag{19}$$

where P_S is determined as follows [18]

$$P_S(y, t, y_0) = \frac{\sigma}{\ln^2 t}\left[Q\left(\frac{\sigma(y-y_0)}{ln^2 t}\right) - Q\left(\frac{\sigma(y+y_0)}{ln^2 t}\right)\right] \tag{20}$$

and

$$Q(X) = \frac{4}{\pi}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^m}{2m+1}e^{-\frac{1}{4}\pi^2|X|(2m+1)^2}. \tag{21}$$

Here σ is the variance of the random field $\eta(y)$

$$< \eta(y)\eta(y' >= 2\sigma\delta(y-y'). \tag{22}$$

Our approach differs from the one of [10] since we include entropic effects which are neglected there. Using Eqs.(19)-(21) one can calculate the survival probability of the bubble $C(y_0,t) = \int_0^\infty P(y,t,y_0)dy$. After integration on y, we get

$$\begin{aligned} C(y_0,t) = \frac{16\delta}{\pi^3}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^m}{2m+1}\frac{1}{(\delta(2m+1)^2)^{1-\nu}} \times \\ \times\Big[e^{-\delta(2m+1)^2}(-1)^{\nu-1}\gamma(1-\nu,-\delta(2m+1)^2)+ \\ +e^{\delta(2m+1)^2}\Gamma(1-\nu,\delta(2m+1)^2) - e^{-\delta(2m+1)^2}\Gamma(1-\nu)\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $\gamma(x,y), \Gamma(x,y)$ are incomplete gamma functions, $\Gamma(x)$ is the proper gamma function,$\delta = \frac{\pi^2\sigma y_0}{4ln^2 t}$ and we assume that $\nu < 1$. Let us now consider the asymptotic behavior of $C(y_0,t)$. Substituting asymptotic expressions for γ, Γ into Eq.(16), one obtains for $\delta \gg 1$.

$$C(y_0,t) \sim \frac{32}{\pi^3}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^m}{(2m+1)^3}, \tag{24}$$

In the large time limit $\delta \ll 1$, expanding Eq.(16) over δ we obtain

$$C(y_0,t) \sim \frac{16\delta^{1+\nu}\Gamma(1-\nu)}{\pi^3}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^m}{2m+1}(2m+1)^{2\nu}. \tag{25}$$

As it follows from Eq.(25) the sum diverges for $\nu > 0$. However this divergence is artificial and caused by the expansion on δ. Indeed, the sum (23) converges for large m. Therefore the divergent sum in Eq.(25) should be cut on some value M, at which the expression under the initial, correct sum (23) becomes of order of unity $M^3\delta \sim 1$. Hence the divergent sum (25) can be estimated as follows

$$C(y_0,t) \sim \frac{16\Gamma(1-\nu)\delta^{1+\nu}M^{2\nu}}{\pi^3} \sim \frac{16\Gamma(1-\nu)\delta^{1+\nu/3}}{\pi^3}. \tag{26}$$

Note that the peculiarity in prescaling factors in Eqs. (16) and (26) for $\nu \geq 1$ is associated with the fact that we neglect the unity in the entropic factor $(1+y)^{-\nu}$ and introduce an artificial divergency at $y = 0$ which turns out to be important for $\nu > 1$. Actually the scaling laws Eqs. (16) and (26) are caused by the behavior at large y therefore with some non-peculiar prefactors they will be correct also for $\nu > 1$. Using Eq.(26) one can find the first passage time [15] distribution function for large times

$$W(t) = -\frac{dC(t)}{dt} \sim \frac{1}{(lnt)^{3+2\nu/3}t}. \tag{27}$$

It follows from Eq.(27) that the integral determining the bubble life time in denaturation $\tau \sim \int_0^\infty tW(t)dt$ diverges. It should be cut at some large time scale. As was mentioned above, the representation (12) is correct also for a heterogeneous DNA. In this case E_n and $\Psi_n(y)$ are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of a random Hamiltonian consisting of terms $\nu\eta(y,t)/(y+1)$ and $\eta'(y,T)/2$. Taking into account that $\eta(y,T)$ and $\eta'(y,T)$ are limited when $y \to \infty$ and treating them perturbatively with the set Eq.(14) one can show that, similar to the homogeneous case $E_n \sim n^2/L^2$ when $n \to 0$. Using the same reasoning as in the homogeneous case one finds that PDF of heterogeneous DNA is also exponentially small for $t \gg L^2$ Cutting off the integral on the scale L^2 one finds the dependence of the bubble life time on DNA length in denaturation

$$\tau \sim \frac{L^2}{(lnL)^{3+2\nu/3}} \tag{28}$$

It follows from Eq.(28) that in the thermodynamical limit $L \to \infty$ the bubble life time is infinite for any ν. This result correlates with the exact result in statics [22] that the heterogeneity makes the order of denaturation transition higher than one.

In summary, we have considered the bubble life time problem in denaturation for homogeneous as well as for heterogeneous DNA. For a homogeneous finite length DNA a scaling behavior is found when the entropic index $c < 2$. For $c > 2$ the bubble life time is finite in the thermodynamical limit. Heterogeneity strengthens the L-dependence and leads to a significant increase of the bubble life time. It becomes infinite in the thermodynamical limit for any value of entropic index c. At non- critical temperatures a DNA bubble in a finite time is closing when $T < T_c$ and is opening when $T > T_c$ [12]. Our results are consistent with the statical picture of denaturation transition.

This work was supported by National Science Council in Taiwan under Grant No. NSC 96-2911-M 001-003-MY3, by National Center for Theoretical Sciences in Taiwan, and by Academia Sinica (Taiwan) under Grant No. AS-95-TP-A07. Zh.S.G. is grateful to

A.Allahverdyan, Mai Suan Li and D.Mukamel for helpful discussions.

---

[1] D.Poland and H.A.Scheraga, *Theory of Helix-Coil Transitions in Biopolymers* (Academic Press, New York, 1970).

[2] R.M.Wartell and A.S.Benight, Phys.Rep. **126**, 67, (1985).

[3] M.Guéron,M.Kochoyan and J.L.Leroy, Nature(London),**328**,89,(1987).

[4] T.Hwa, E.Marinari, K.Sneppen and L.H.Tang, Proc.Natl.Acad.Sci. U.S.A.,**100**,4411,(2003).

[5] A.Hanke and R.Metzler, J.Phys.A,**36**,L473,(2003).

[6] Yan Zeng, Awrasa Montrichok and Giovanni Zocchi, Phys.Rev.Lett., **91**,148101,(2003).

[7] D.J.Bicout and E.Kats, Phys.Rev.E,**70**, 010902(R),(2004).

[8] Jae-Hyung Jeon, Pyeong Jun Park and Wokyung Sun,J.Chem.Phys.,**125**, 164901,(2006).

[9] S.Ares, G.Kalosakas, Nano Letters, **7**,307,(2007).

[10] A.Bar, Y.Kafri and D.Mukamel, Phys.Rev.Lett.,**98**,038103(2007);cond-mat.stat-mech/0807.0306v.

[11] H.C.Fogedby and R.Metzler,Phys.Rev.Lett.,**98**,070601(2007).

[12] H.C.Fogedby and R.Metzler,Phys.Rev.E.,**76**,061915(2007)and references therein.

[13] G.Alan-Bonnet, A.Libchaber and O.Krichevsky,Phys.Rev.Lett.,**90**,138101(2003).

[14] H.Risken,The Fokker-Planck Equation:Method of Solution and Applications,Springer-Verlag,Berlin,1989.

[15] S.Redner, A Guide To First-Passage Time Processes,Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[16] I.S.Gradshteyn and I.M.Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals,Series and Products* (Academic Press, New York, 1965).

[17] Y.G.Sinai,Theor.Probab.Apple. bf 27, 247,(1982).

[18] P.Le Doussal, C.Monthus and D.Fisher, Phys.Rev.E,**59**,4795,(1999).

[19] D.Poland and H.A.Scheraga, J.Chem.Phys.**45**,1456,1464,(1966).

[20] M.E.Fisher,J.Chem.Phys.,**45**, 1469,(1966).

[21] Y.Kafri,D.Mukamel and L.Peliti,Phys.Rev.Lett.,**85**,4988,(2000).

[22] G.Giacomin and F.L.Toninelli, Phys.Rev.Lett. **96**,060702,(2006).